

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

DEC 0 5 2016

Mavis Busiek

Springfield, MO 65809

RE: MUR 7046

Dear Ms. Busiek:

The Federal Election Commission reviewed the allegations in your complaint received on April 21, 2016. On November 30, 2016, based upon the information provided in the complaint, and information provided by the respondents, the Commission decided to exercise its prosecutorial discretion to dismiss the allegations and close its file in this matter. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on November 30, 2016.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66132 (Dec. 14, 2009). A copy of the dispositive General Counsel's Response is enclosed for your information.

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(8).

Sincerely,

Lisa J. Stevenson

Acting General Counsel

BY: Jeff/S, Jordan

Assistant General Counsel
Complaints Examination and
Legal Administration

Enclosure
General Counsel's Report

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

SENSITIVE

ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM **DISMISSAL REPORT**

MUR: 7046

Respondents: Matthew Evans for Congress

Complaint Receipt Date: April 21, 2016

(the "Committee")1

Response Date(s): May 9, 2016

Matthew Evans

EPS Rating:

Alleged Statutory Regulatory Violations: 52 U.S.C. § 30120(a), (c) 11 C.F.R. § 110.11(a)-(c)

The Complaint alleges that Matthew Evans, a candidate for Missouri's 7th Congressional District, solicited donations on his campaign website without using proper disclaimer notices. Evans responded by acknowledging that the website had not initially contained proper disclaimers, and stating that disclaimers had been added to the website and would be included on all future communications.2

All public communications paid for by a political committee and authorized by a candidate. as well as websites of political committees available to the general public, must include a disclaimer clearly stating who paid for the communication.³ 52 U.S.C. § 30120(a)(1). See also 11 C.F.R. § 110.11(a)(1), (b)(1), (c)(1). The available information indicates that Evans's campaign website

Evans states that he was a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives in the 7th Gongressional District of Missouri, although he did not file a Statement of Candidacy with the Commission, nor did the Committee file a Statement of Organization. There is, however, insufficient information as to whether Evans met the definition of a candidate under 52 U.S.C. § 30101(2), and we do not believe it is an efficient use of agency resources to look into this issue further. Public records show that Evans appeared on the ballot for the August 2, 2016, primary election, in which he finished fourth, with just under 5% of the vote. See http: "enrarchives.sqs.mq.gov/enrnet/PickaRace.aspx. Accessed November: 7, 2016.

A review of Evans's website confirms that appropriate disclaimers are present. See http://www.matthewevansforcongress.com; http://www.matthewevansforcongress.com/donate1.html. Accessed November 2, 2016.

Although there is insufficient information to determine if Evans met the definition of a candidate under 52 U.S.C. § 30101(2), for purposes of this analysis, we treat this matter under the same standards as applied to registered congressional candidates.

EPS Dismissal Report MUR 7046 (Matthew Evans for Congress) Page 2 of 3

did not initially include any disclaimers, however, it appears that disclaimers were added soon after

Evans became aware of the issue.⁴

Based on its experience and expertise, the Commission has established an Enforcement Priority System using formal, pre-determined scoring criteria to allocate agency resources and assess whether particular matters warrant further administrative enforcement proceedings. These criteria include (1) the gravity of the alleged violation, taking into account both the type of activity and the amount in violation; (2) the apparent impact the alleged violation may have had on the electoral process; (3) the complexity of the legal issues raised in the matter; and (4) recent trends in potential violations and other developments in the law. This matter is rated as low priority for Commission action after application of these pre-established criteria. Given that low rating, and the quick remedial action of adding disclaimers to the website, we recommend that the Commission dismiss the allegations consistent with the Commission's prosecutorial discretion to determine the proper ordering of its priorities and use of agency resources. *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831-32 (1985). We also recommend that the Commission close the file as to all respondents and send the appropriate letters.

Notification of the Complaint was mailed to Evans on April 27, 2016. Evans responded via email on May 8, 2016, stating that disclaimers had been added to the website.

Lisa J. Stevenson Acting General Counsel

Kathleen M. Guith Acting Associate General Counsel for Enforcement

11.10.16 Date BY:

Stephen Gura

Deputy Associate General Counsel

for Enforcement

Jeff S. Jordan

Assistant General Counsel Complaints Examination

& Legal Administration

Donald E. Campbell

Attorney

Complaints Examination

& Legal Administration